

Serial No. **10/036,378**
Amendment dated January 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 19, 2006

Docket No. **LT-0010**

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 13, 18, 25, 27, 28 and 32-36 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-21, 23-25 and 27-37 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-21, 23-25 and 27-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,272,545 (Flanagin et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/139076 (Pendleton).

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended this claim to further clarify the invention and respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-21, 23-25 and 27-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flanagan et al. in view of Pendleton. Applicant has discussed the deficiencies of each of these references in Applicant's previously filed responses and reasserts all arguments submitted in those responses. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and provides the

Serial No. **10/036,378**

Amendment dated January 16, 2007

Reply to Office Action of October 19, 2006

Docket No. **LT-0010**

following additional remarks.

Regarding claims 1, 13, 18, 25, 33 and 36, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, converting a format of composed data from a first format to a second format suitable for a second application program using a conversion program, the first application program, the conversion program and the second application program being initiated and executed on the personal information terminal, or the conversion program being capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into data in a format of any other of the plurality of application programs. The Examiner admits that Flanagan et al. does not disclose or suggest these limitations but asserts that Pendleton discloses these limitations in paragraphs 1, 6, 10 and 26-28. However, these portions merely disclose that in order to account for differences in the design of the database of a medical insurance provider and the design of the database of an insurer for a patient, an insurer provides the medical service provider with data entry software that receives data into predetermined fields and formats the entered data into a form that the database software of the patient's insurer is expecting, and that a server selects the appropriate conversion routine by determining who is the transmitter of the record and who is the receiver of the record, where the server contains multiple conversion routines and receives a record in a format, converts the record based on the appropriate conversion routine and transmits the converted

Serial No. 10/036,378

Amendment dated January 16, 2007

Docket No. LT-0010

Reply to Office Action of October 19, 2006

record for processing. Based on the transmitter and who the receiver is, a conversion routine is identified. This is not converting a format of the composed data from the first format to a second format suitable for a second application program using a conversion program initiated and executed on the personal information terminal, as recited in the claims of the present application. Pendleton merely discloses (1) that a user interface program is used for inputting data and performing a conversion, and that (2) a server separate and distinct from the transmitter and receiver perform conversion. In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to a first application program, a second application program, and a third application program all being initiated and executed on the personal information terminal. Paragraph 6 of Pendleton merely discloses a single program used for data entry and conversion.

Moreover, these portions do not disclose or suggest a conversion program capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into data in a format of any of the plurality of application programs, as recited in the claims of the present application. Pendleton discloses multiple conversion programs where one is selected depending on the transmitter and receiver. Further, as noted previously, the plurality of conversion programs reside at a server. In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to a first application program and a second application program of a plurality of application programs and a conversion program that are all initiated and executed on the personal information terminal. Moreover, the conversion program is capable of converting data from any

Serial No. 10/036,378

Amendment dated January 16, 2007

Reply to Office Action of October 19, 2006

Docket No. LT-0010

one of the application programs into a format of any other of the plurality of application programs. These limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested by Flanagan et al. nor Pendleton.

Moreover, Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine Flanagan et al. with Pendleton in an attempt to achieve the limitations in the claims of the present application. This combination merely produces a system including a computer or server, a first mobile device and a second mobile device where when the mobile device connects to the computer or server, an identifier stored in the mobile device determines the interaction between the mobile device and the computer based on stored respective set of settings corresponding to the identifier, where one or more of the mobile devices includes data entry software that allows entry of data and either converts the data to a specific format or allows transmitting of the entered data to a computer or server for conversion to a specific format based on the sender and receiver of the data. This combination fails to disclose or suggest the limitations in the claims of the present application and one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to make this combination as it teaches away from the limitations in the claims of the present application that relate to activities solely within a personal information terminal.

Regarding claims 2-12, 14-17, 19-21, 23, 24, 27-32, 34, 35 and 37, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 13, 18, 25 and 33 and, therefore, are

Serial No. **10/036,378**

Amendment dated January 16, 2007

Reply to Office Action of October 19, 2006

Docket No. **LT-0010**

patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-21, 23-25 and 27-37 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **10/036,378**
Amendment dated January 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 19, 2006

Docket No. **LT-0010**

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-21, 23-25 and 27-37 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey, Esq.
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlgjl

Date: January 16, 2007

\\Fk4\Documents\2031\2031-005\108260.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610